

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 were examined in the outstanding office action mailed on 03/27/2006 (hereafter "Outstanding Office Action"). Applicants note with appreciation that claims 1-12 (and though not so stated in the Outstanding Office Action, also claims 24 and 25, by virtue of dependence from allowed claim 1) were allowed and claims 18 and 26 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent format including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 13-17 and 19-25 were rejected.

By virtue of this response, independent claims 13 and 19 are sought to be amended, and claim 26 is sought to be canceled. The amendments and cancellation are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Claims 1-25 are thus presented for reconsideration, further in view of the below remarks.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 13-17 and 19-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capowski *et al* (US Pat. 6,693,532) in view of Kirschner *et al* (US Pat. 6,856,258 B2). The rejections are rendered moot at least in view of the above amendments, as explained below.

Independent claim 13 is sought to be amended to include at least several features of claim 26, indicated to be allowable but now canceled. Accordingly, amended claim 13 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 14-18 are allowable at least as depending from allowable base claim 13.

Amended independent claims 19 is also allowable over the art of record at least as reciting in relevant parts:

A computer readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions for causing a station to provide increased operational control over evacuation procedures when an undesirable situation is detected, said station being connected to a network, wherein execution of said one or more sequences of instructions by one or more processors causes said one or more processors to perform the actions of:

receiving on said network a packet containing an alarm, said ***alarm indicating***

the detection of said undesirable situation; and

sending a voice data and a control data in the form of a plurality of packets *in response to said receiving*, wherein each of said plurality of packets contains an address of a voice point module, wherein said voice point module is accessible by said address, wherein said voice point module processes said voice data according to said control data.

(Currently amended independent claim 19, ***Emphasis Added***)

Neither Capowski nor Kirschner discloses or reasonably suggests (in combination or individually) the feature of sending voice data to voice point modules in response to receiving alarms on a network, as claimed.

Currently amended independent claim 19 is accordingly allowable over the art of record. Dependent claims 20-23 are allowable at least as depending from the allowable base claim 19.

Claim 23 is independently allowable at least as reciting, "... wherein said control data specifies a volume level of a speaker is to be changed, wherein said voice point module causes said volume level of said speaker to be changed in response to receiving said control data." The art of record does not appear to disclose such control of volume level (at the voice point module) from a station.

Conclusion

Thus, all the objections and rejections are believed to be overcome and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at 707.356.4172 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/

Signature

Date: September 28, 2006

Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number: 41,416